

Final WQMR Workgroup Meeting Discussion Guide

Meeting Objectives

1. Hold polls for the approval of all workgroup recommendations and resources
 - Polling will be to approve the final versions as is. There are no more opportunities for modifications. Discussion for future modifications/considerations can be addressed in the SaMS document as ideas to consider in the future or as “Recommendations for the Future” (in that dedicated section of the document).
2. Discuss how to frame select recommendations/resources in the final SaMS document that were not addressed at the last meeting.
3. Discuss options and opportunities for implementing the recommendations. In particular, discuss how to fund and implement the pilot water quality monitoring program.

Polling Process

Similar to how polling was done at the last SAC meeting, we will vote on the final versions of workgroup recommendations and resources. Each organization will get one vote. For each final resource/recommendation, the polling options will be as follows:

- Green = “In support of the final version of the recommendation/resource”
- Yellow = “Can live with the final version of the recommendation/resource”
- Red = “Cannot live with the final version of the recommendation/resource”

If over 50% of the present organizations vote either green or yellow, the recommendation/resource is approved. Where any organization holds up a red card to indicate they “cannot live with the final version,” we will document the concerns. Depending on the nature of the concerns, they will either only be documented, or, if time allows, we will discuss options for addressing the concerns in the SaMS document.

Finalizing Workgroup Recommendations/Resources

Grab-and go resource for organizations looking to implement water quality monitoring recommendations of the SaMS:

1. Hold poll to approve the resource

Conceptual Model of Salt Origin, Transport, and Fate

1. Hold poll to approve the resource

Long-term trends in Specific Conductance throughout the region

1. Highlight the changes to the report since the conference call (trends on median monthly and median annual values)
2. Hold poll to approve final resource
3. How should the Specific Conductance trends be presented in the final SaMS document (e.g., recommended uses, methods for reproducibility, process for updates, etc.)? A few other trends reports have been discussed, how should they be referenced?

General Criteria for a Monitoring Program

1. Highlight the changes to the document since the conference call
2. Hold poll to approve final recommendations
3. How should we address these recommendations in SaMS document? The current plan is to have this as an appendix with language in the body of the report that frames its use/purpose. What important points should be made in the body of the SaMS report?

Regional Models to Predict Chloride Concentration from Specific Conductance

1. Discuss data used to develop models for the SaMS project area. The available data was limited, with the majority coming from one watershed. Additionally, there was limited data available that could be used to develop a model for watersheds primarily draining Triassic soils, even when looking into Maryland.
 - a. Recommend the workgroup consider using the Mid-Atlantic Regional piecewise model that has similar slopes to SaMS project area models and were developed with a more robust dataset (over 2 times bigger) for the Mid-Atlantic region. With that recommendation comes two caveats:
 - i. Watershed specific models should still be the goal since watershed specific models can deviate slightly from regional models
 - ii. Use of this model in watersheds draining primarily Triassic soils should be avoided
2. Hold poll to approve final resource
3. What is the workgroup's preference for discussing chloride-conductivity relationships in the final SaMS document?

Pilot Water Quality Monitoring Program

1. Highlight the changes to the document since the conference call
2. Hold poll to approve final recommendations
3. How should we address these recommendations in SaMS document? The current plan is to have this as an appendix with language in the body of the report that frames its use/purpose. What important points should be made in the body of the SaMS report? Should we consider discussion of a review panel to make sure that the pilot is implemented consistent with the recommendations?

Implementing the Recommendations

1. Of primary concern is how to implement the pilot program. What sort of funding needs and opportunities exist?
 - a. Similarly, are any workgroup members in a position to assist in the implementation of the pilot program?
 - b. What other partner organizations/researchers should we recommend implement this program?
 - c. Are there other initiatives/projects in the region that can help implement this recommended program?
 - d. Should we address how to identify winter maintenance organizations willing to partner on this project?
2. What other recommendations can we identify funding resources for? What resources might they be?
3. How do we want to address this topic in the final SaMS report?